R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 652 RC 001 151

AN EXPLORATION OF RURAL JUVENILE DELINQUENCY.

BY- POLK, KENNETH

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH

PUB DATE SEP 63

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.80 20P.

DESCRIPTORS- CRIME, CULTURAL BACKGROUND, DROPOUTS, DISADVANTAGED GROUPS, *RURAL AREAS, DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, *DELINQUENTS, DELINQUENCY BEHAVIOR, *DELINQUENCY CAUSES, DELINQUENT ROLE, DELINQUENT REHABILITATION, ECONOMIC STATUS, FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS, *FAMILY INFLUENCE, RURAL FAMILY, *RURAL ENVIRONMENT, LANE COUNTY YOUTH STUDY PROJECT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THIS SPEECH STATES THAT STUDIES INDICATE THAT DELINQUENCY IN RURAL AREAS TENDS TO BE LESS SERIOUS IN TERMS OF THE ACTS COMMITTED AND IS TREATED MORE LENIENTLY THAN IN METROPOLITAN AREAS. THE DELINQUENCY THAT DOES EXIST IS A MALE PROBLEM, OCCURS PREDOMINATELY AMONG YOUTH FROM LOWER-ECONOMIC-STATUS BACKGROUNDS, REFLECTS ALIENATION FROM COMMUNITY AND SCHOOL, AND SEEMS TO HAVE A SUBCULTURAL COMPONENT. ADULTS SEEM WILLING TO SUPPORT PROGRAMS TO HELP TROUBLE-PRONE YOUTH. TABLES PRESENT PERCENTAGES OF IN- AND OUT-OF-SCHOOL DELINQUENT AND NONDELINQUENT YOUTH IN THE SMALL CITY AREA BY ECONOMIC, CULTURAL, AND FAMILY VARIABLES. THIS PAPER WAS PREPARED FOR PRESENTATION AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PROBLEMS OF RURAL YOUTH IN A CHANGING ENVIRONMENT (SEPTEMBER 1963). (SF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED012652

AN EXPLORATION OF RURAL JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

by

Kenneth Polk
Director of Research
Lane County Youth Study Project
and
Assistant Professor of Sociology
University of Oregon

National Committee for Children and Youth
1145 Nineteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

AC 001 151

AN EXPLORATION OF RURAL JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

by

Kenneth Polk
Director of Research
Lane County Youth Study Project
and
Assistant Professor of Sociology
University of Oregon

Prepared for

The National Conference on Problems of Rural Youth
in a Changing Environment

September 1963

AN EXPLORATION OF RURAL JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

by

Kenneth Polk
Director of Research
Lane County Youth Study Project
and
Assistant Professor of Sociology
University of Oregon

ABSTRACT

It is a general finding that hinterland delinquency is a different kind of "thing" than urban delinquency. Other studies, as well as the present Lane County Project, show that delinquency in rural areas tends to be less serious in terms of the acts committed, and to be treated in general in a more lenient manner, i.e., rural communities are somewhat more tolerant of misbehavior. The delinquency that does exist is a male problem which shows a definite linking of lower economic social position and alienation from community and school, and it does appear to have a subcultural compontent. While some differences seem to occur between adults and youth, adults seem to be relatively tolerant of youth and do not perceive either delinquency or school drop-outs as being a major problem. At the same time, they appear willing to support a number of programs to bring about improved services to trouble-prone youth.

AN EXPLORATION OF RURAL JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	i
Introduction	1
Review of Previous Studies	1
What the Hinterland Delinquent Youth is Like	1
How the Rural Offender is Handled	3
The Lane County Youth Study Project	6
Perception of a Problem: Official Delinquency	6
Handling of a Problem: Official Disposition	7
Characteristics of Troublesome Youth	7
The Community Context of Delinquency	10
Hinterland Delinquency, a Summary	10
Footnotes	14

AN EXPLORATION OF RURAL JUVENILE DELINQUENCY*

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to explore the problem of juvenile delinquency in rural areas. Viewed from any direction, the study of juvenile delinquency is complicated. Not the least of the complications is the difficulty in establishing some definition of the relevant terms. "Juvenile Delinquency" will refer in these sections to youth who have engaged in some behavior which has resulted in their being processed by juvenile authorities. This definition of delinquency has two major components: (1) action on the part of a youngster, and (2) action by juvenile authorities with respect to the given youth. Comparisons of rural delinquency with urban delinquency, as well as comparisons among rural areas, require that attention be given both to differential commission of acts on the part of youngsters, and differential disposition of such acts by juvenile authorities.

"Rural areas" are defined in a broad sense to include hinterland areas, i.e., small towns which are engaged in such extractive activities as mining, lumbering, fishing and similar industries will be considered "rural," as well as rural farm areas.

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS STUDIES

WHAT THE HINTERLAND DELINQUENT YOUTH IS LIKE

While there have not been as many studies of hinterland delinquency as of urban delinquency, in the past few years a number of excellent studies have been made. These investigations have found several differences between rural and urban delinquent youth, especially with regard to the nature of the delinquent activity. Review of earlier research suggests that rural youth in general commit offenses of a less serious nature than their urban counterparts. In examination of the offense comparisons in one study, rural boys more often than urban boys were institutionalized for such offenses as nominal burglary and "general misconduct," but less often for the more serious offenses such as auto theft and serious burglary. 1/ Difference in sex offenses, theft and truancy between the two groups were not significant.

Not only are the acts less serious, but, as we might expect, one uniform finding is that delinquent youth from rural areas are much less sophisticated in their delinquencies than are the urban boys. Clinard has found that rural offenders do not exhibit the characteristics of a definite criminal social type as defined by: (1) an early start in criminal behavior, (2) progressive knowledge of criminal techniques and crime in general, (3) crime as the sole

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

*This study is supported by a grant from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, the grant being administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. (Grant No. 63001, HEW)

means of livelihood, and (4) a self concept of being a criminal. 2/ Partial support for these findings are contained in the work of Lentz, who reports that rural offenders were less likely to be repeat offenders, and also displayed much less knowledge of criminal practices in the commission of their offense. 3/

Among rural youth, the existence of distinct criminal or delinquent subculture is reported only rarely. In his early study of rural criminal offenders, Clinard finds a comparative absence of gangs in the life histories of his subjects. Even where companions are noted, usually only two or three persons rather than a gang are involved. 4/ Lentz reports that 52 percent of the rural boys compared with only 16 percent of urban boys in Wisconsin were lone offenders. Further, 22 percent of rural boys compared with 87 percent of urban boys were members of gangs which were known to be composed of delinquent boys. 5/

Clinard emphasizes the role of the criminal culture in the explanation of rural crime and delinquency:

"A characteristic of the rural offenders was that they did not regard their actions as crimes or themselves as criminals. It is obvious that this is very significant in accounting for the differences in crime rates between areas of varying degrees of urbanization. The life-histories seemed to substantiate a hypothesis that this noncriminal conception of self is an outgrowth of a limited process or urbanization. To develop a criminal social type there must be in existence some organized criminal culture which is at least tolerated in the area and through which deviant norms are transmitted. Criminal techniques, argot, and progressive association with others having criminal associations are necessary for a criminal career; and without their presence an offender may commit a crime in the legal sense without being a criminal in a sociological sense. The division of labor and heterogeneity of standards of an urban world make possible the existence of a criminal culture independent of the traditional culture. Where there exist the opposite characteristics of urbanization, such as general homogeneity of culture and more general personal behavior, it is difficult to identify one's self with a criminal world. Rural offenders are not criminal social types, owing to the fact that in areas of limited urbanization there have been few opportunities to become identified with a separate criminal culture." 6/

While there may not be a "professional" criminal culture, there may exist a "troublemaking" subculture among hinterland youth that corresponds closely to what has been called the "parent delinquent subculture." Empey describes this pattern in a hinterland community in Utah:

"Despite the fact that Utah County is not a highly urbanized area, when compared to large metropolitan centers, the concept of a "parent" delinquent subculture has real meaning for it. While there are no clear-cut gangs, per se, it is surprising to observe the extent to which delinquent boys from the entire county, who have never met, know each other by reputation, go with the same girls, use the same language, or can seek each other out when they change high schools. About half of them are permanently out of school, do not participate in any regular institutional activities, are reliant almost entirely

upon the delinquent system for social acceptance and participation." 7/

Some further insight into the nature of rural delinquency can be found in the important study conducted by John Clark and Eugene P. Wenninger of the University of Illinois. 8/ These writers used a "self-report" method to trace patterns of delinquent behavior in four kinds of settings. This investigation is useful because it permits us to make comparisons between a small "Industrial City" group of adolescents, an urban working class group, an urban upper class group, and a group of rural farm adolescents. In each case, public school youth were asked to report their commission of certain acts in a self-administered, anonymous questionnaire. The response to this questionnaire would indicate for the groups studied by Clark and Wenninger, rural boys differ very little from urban boys in the extent to which they "confess" to minor theft, the telling of lies, loitering, beating up other youngsters without specific reason, the use of narcotics (in all samples rare), and arson (also rare in all groups). Rural farm youth engage less, according to this study, in such activities as major theft, the consumption of alcohol, taking money on the pretense that it would be repaid, and skipping school. On the other hand, rural youth were inclined to engage somewhat more in trespassing and tampering with another person's car, tractor, or bicycle without permission. These differences are especially pronounced when a comparison is made between the urban working class group and rural youth.

To summarize, a number of earlier studies show that the delinquency of rural youth is less sophisticated than their urban counterparts. Not only are their acts of a less serious nature, but they are less often involved with a criminal culture. At the same time, there is some evidence for a subcultural base to some hinterland delinquency.

HOW THE RURAL OFFENDER IS HANDLED

Delinquency occurs when a youth commits some act which, if both youth and act are known, the community takes formal action. Differential handling of rural offenders in rural areas stems from four major sources: (1) differences in the kinds of behaviors engaged in by youth, (2) differential definitions as to what constitutes a delinquent act, that is, the norms defining what is delinquent are different, (3) differences in the way that communities think the problem should be handled, and (4) differences in the exercise of official control by juvenile authorities (rural jurisdictions typically have too few men with less than adequate training). These factors taken together produce the phenomenon of delinquency, and each is an important ingredient of the problem.

There is no question that rural youth, however troublesome, do not exhibit the same kinds of problem behavior as found in the metropolitan centers. The use of narcotics is virtually nonexistent, and, as indicated above, "professional" criminal activity among youth is quite rare. Accordingly, one large component of the "different" nature of rural delinquency has to do with the fact that hinterland youngsters engage in different kinds of behavior.

This fact alone, however, does not tell the whole story since it does not account for variations between different kinds of rural areas, or even within

one given rural area. It is here that we must consider what the community defines as delinquent, and what procedures are regarded as proper for dealing with the problem. An example of such differentials within one community are reported in Hollingshead's study of Elmtown:

"The nightly search for excitement by speeding, shooting firearms along the river roads, drinking, picking up girls, gambling, with now and again a fight, brings many of these young people face-to-face with the law. Pleasure-bent youths violate the mores, if not the law, almost every night, but they are not overly interested in the consequences of their acts. Actually, they seldom think about this aspect of their behavior until they find themselves in trouble. This does not occur often, for they seldom commit offenses serious enough to bring them to the attention of the police or the sheriff. When they do, the differences which adults attach to the roles played by the withdrawees in comparison with high school students become clear. The police, and adults in general, assume that parents, often the school, are to blame when a student is apprehended for violation of the law. However, when a withdrawee of the same age commits an offense of the same nature officials hold him responsible. The deliberate protection-of-the-pupil policy which fails to place responsibility on the student who violates the law, in contrast to the application of adult judgments to the withdrawee, before he has developed a sense of personal responsibility for his behavior, results in a very much higher incidence of official delinquency in the out-of-school series than in the in-school one." 9/

The same differential processes serve to complicate urban-rural comparisons of delinquency. It takes little imagination to think of the consequences that would occur in a large metropolitan area if a lower-class slum dweller who was under the influence of alcohol would smash into a show-piece upper class estate in his car, and then pass out on the lawn. Hopper has described an instance where this occurred in a small, homogeneous, rural community:

"Mrs. Gunderson lives at the edge of town. She has what is conceded to be one of the "showplaces" of Bethel County. Frank and Charley Baker, two old bachelor brothers, live in a little shack four miles down the same road away from town. Frank and Charley don't come into town very often, but when they do, they usually take a little too much in the way of alcoholic refreshment. When they do this, the sheriff usually lets them sleep it off in the county jail. Saturday afternoon, however, he failed to notice them and they started home in their old rattletrap,loaded. They were on the straight stretch of road just in front of Mrs. Gunderson's when something went wrong with their calculations. They drove up in her front yard, after tearing down a picket fence, parked against a tree, and both of them passed out. All of this in the front yard of one of Bethel County's elite. Almost any place else, this is enough to mean the State Farm at the very least. Not to Mrs. Gunderson, however; she and one of the hired men brought Frank and Charley into the house, partially sobered them up with coffee, fed them, took them home, put them to bed and towed home the car." 10/

Hopper suggest that as the rural communities become less homogeneous as a result of expanding urbanism, instability in social class systems become

more pronounced, increasing the tendency for deviants to be handled formally rather than informally. Thus, the extent of such instability may account for different patterns of disposition between rural areas.

Adams has pointed out another example of differential control mechanisms operating in rural areas. As a result of his investigation of girls sent to the Training School in Colorado, he suggests that there are closer and stronger controls placed upon the sexual conduct of girls in small communities than in larger, more impersonal urban areas. It appears that in the rural community the sexual acting-out of girls is met with stronger sanctions, perhaps because the acts of the girls are felt to be more of an offense against morality than are the acts of boys. 11/

The extent of the given behavior (sex offense) may be the same as in the urban areas, but the norms differ such that this is defined as a problem of concern, and girls are consequently dealt with more severely. It is significant that in this study, more girls were sent to the State Training School from rural areas, whereas just the opposite was the case for males.

A final factor in the handling of delinquent youth is the exercise of official control by juvenile authorities. The delinquency rate in one region of Lane County was reduced to almost nothing recently by the simple act of removing the resident deputy sheriff. This incident shows the impact that differential law enforcement can have on the recorded delinquency of a given area. The training and background of the typical rural law enforcement official also will produce differentials in the kinds of delinquency that are recorded.

The law enforcement officer is a vital link in the process that produces delinquency, since it is his action that gives rise to the official label of "juvenile delinquent." Accordingly, the "discretion" he applies in deciding what offenders receive official attention is important in understanding the nature of delinquency in the hinterland. Esselstyn has made a study of this process in his analysis of the role of the rural county sheriff:

"...What of offenses not known? Informants who had reported offenses were interviewed and in almost every case they disclosed other offenses which they had not reported. As a general practice, the rule of silence is invoked in four circumstances: where the theft or offense 'didn't amount to much,' or where it was felt that a report 'won't do any good'; where the threat of a report is countered by an apology, an offer of marriage, or restitution; where there is fear of reprisal, real or imagined; and where a report might threaten community harmony. This last involves extreme cases such as unexplained deaths, suspected incest, fires or explosions of unknown origin, and the like. It is impossible to get specific facts in these instances. However, accounts of these events are transmitted to the young and to the objective investigator in a context designed to show the limits beyond which it is regarded as unwise to resort to formal legal sanctions-unwise because it is felt that ultimate justice has or will be done, or because of the fear that group life will be shattered if neighbor must testify against neighbor." 12/

In summary, rural areas may have a different picture of recorded delinquency as a result of differentials in the way juvenile delinquencies are

handled. While these differentials primarily are a function of the norms of the community which define delinquency and which specify how it is to be treated, also they are accounted for by the differential nature of the problem itself and of the differentials in the structure of juvenile agencies in rural areas.

THE LANE COUNTY YOUTH STUDY PROJECT

The original data for this report are drawn from a study in Lane County, Oregon. Lane County is a hinterland area of western Oregon, located midway between the Columbia River and the California state line. It runs 120 miles from the Pacific Ocean on the west, crosses the low, wood-covered Coast Range, spans the upper end of the fertile Willamette Valley, and extends to the summit of the rugged, heavily forested Cascade Range. In this area roughly the size of Connecticut, the 1960 population was approximately 160,000, about 60 percent of whom live in the major trade center of Eugene and Springfield. Employment is concentrated in agriculture, wood and food products, transportation, wholesale trade, and educational services. The study partly focuses upon youth problems in the whole county; otherwise, specific attention is given to youth in three types of communities: (1) rural-farm, (2) rural nonfarm (lumbering), and (3) the area within the small city complex.

In the process of developing a large scale program of delinquency prevention and control, data have been collected from these major sources: (1) a questionnaire survey of all adolescents in the three demonstration area high schools (including a survey of school records); (2) an interview survey with a small number of school withdrawees, both delinquent and nondelinquent; (3) an interview survey of adults in each of the demonstration area communities; (4) a depth interview of five hours duration with a small number of families of both delinquent and nondelinquent youth in each of the demonstration areas; and (5) a records survey of official delinquency, including a records analysis of Juvenile Department (probation department) cases from 1959 through 1962, a depth case analysis 25 percent of these cases, an analysis of the extent to which Juvenile Department cases (or their families) are reported to other agencies such as Public Welfare, District Attorney, Adult Probation and Parole, and the Employment Service (for unemployment benefits), and a survey of the juvenile index of police contacts with juveniles in the County, maintained by the Lane County Sheriff's Office, for the years 1959 through 1962.

PERCEPTION OF A PROBLEM: OFFICIAL DELINQUENCY

When a community decides that it is not willing to tolerate or informally dispose of deviant behavior, it faces the task of officially identifying the delinquent and providing a label for the forbidden activity. The utility of official records lies in their availability for a study of the process of labeling and disposing of undesired behavior. Such records provide a useful document as to what the community thinks is a problem for official attention and how these official problems are processed. They are only secondarily useful in the investigation of the extent of any given behavior in the community, since differential tolerance and informal disposition distort assessment of the behavior presented by official records. Nonetheless, there are some in-

stances where a comparison of types of offenses between jurisdictions reveals actual differentials in the behavior of youth.

A survey of Lane County Juvenile Department records shows that in comparison with other areas, minor "troublesome" offenses more often provide the label for official action (these offenses include truancy, running away, being ungovernable, and "other" offenses). In each of the four years (1959 through 1962) studied, for both males and females, over half of the referrals fell into this category. The commission (and reporting) of dangerous bodily harm offenses is virtually nonexistent in this hinterland community, and the incidence of burglary and auto theft is lower than in large metropolitan areas.

HANDLING OF A PROBLEM: OFFICIAL DISPOSITION

Hinterland areas differ not only in terms of what behaviors come to be labeled "delinquencies," but also with regard to how such labeling takes place and what disposition is made of the cases. One example of such a differential in Lane County has to do with who refers the youngster to the juvenile authorities. As in most jurisdictions the greatest percentage of referrals in Lane County are made by police agencies, but a surprising proportion of cases (especially those involving females) are referred by the parents themselves.

Once cases are referred, over half of male referrals are disposed of by closing the case at intake. In each of the four years studied, a lower proportion of female cases were closed at intake, but even here at least one-third of the female referrals in any given year were handled in this fashion. Furthermore, few of these young people are sent to the state institutions. In no year were more than five percent institutionalized, and the yearly percentage typically is between one and two percent (compared with the 10 percent rate common in metropolitan juvenile probation departments).

The Lane County data are consistent with the findings of other studies which show that, by and large, hinterland youth are charged more often with the minor but troublesome offenses, and are officially handled in a more lenient fashion than one would find in the courts of a large metropolitan center.

CHARACTERISTICS OF TROUBLESOME YOUTH

In the previous section we have examined the question of what the community considers to be delinquent acts, and how it behaves once it labels such acts as delinquent. Now we examine characteristics of individuals who commit such acts. In the analysis of this problem, we drew upon information not only from the records of the juvenile authorities, but also from survey responses of high school youth and withdrawees. Because data are not available for the rural-farm and rural nonfarm youth at this time, the analysis is restricted to male youth in the small city complex.

There appears a dominant economic theme in the delinquency and school withdrawal of these hinterland youth. While 54 percent of the in-school non-delinquent youth in the small urban area had "white collar" fathers, only 43 percent of the in-school, delinquent youth, 22 percent of the drop-out non-

delinquents and none of the drop-out delinquents had fathers engaged in white collar work. In addition, while somewhat over 70 percent of the fathers of in-school, nondelinquent youth had a highschool education or better, only 32 percent of the in-school delinquents, 37 percent of the drop-out nondelinquents, and 8 percent of the drop-out delinquents had fathers with at least 12 years of education.

Not only are the "trouble-prone" youth more frequently found at the lower end of these traditional economic measures, they are also more likely to think that opportunity for advancement is "not very good." Furthermore, other data show that these youngsters are economically vulnerable once they drop out of school, since at the time of the survey 38 percent of the drop-out male population were unemployed, and those who were employed generally were in low income, low status positions.

Closely related to the economic component is a clear alienation theme found in the responses of the trouble-prone youth. These young people appear to be alienated from both community and school. The out-of-school youth are less likely to rate the local public school system as "very good," and are less likely to say that theirs was an excellent high school. Additionally, the trouble-prone are more likely to agree with the statement that "school is dull and boring," and are less likely to believe that the person who habitually skips school is a delinquent.

Trouble-prone youth are less likely to be enrolled in college preparatory classes, and do not show as great a preference for "solid" subjects in school. Moreover, these young persons are less likely to participate in school organizations, and perhaps as a consequence, they feel that they are not close to the "center of things" and are somewhat more likely to agree that "there are a few who control things" in school and "the rest of us are left out in the cold." Finally, to show their rejection of values held by "normal" nondelinquent youths, the trouble-prone person is less likely to agree that high grades are status conferring among males.

Reject usually occurs through interaction in school as well. Although records are not available for the out-of-school youth, among the in-school youth the delinquents are more likely to: have lower grades, be seen by their teachers as currently or potentially being behavior problems, and be rated low on personal characteristics check lists (including "emotional stability," "seriousness of purpose," "industrious," etc.). These results indicate that alienation is a two-way street, involving not only the alienation on the part of the youth, but a symmetrical rejection of the youth by the school and community, suggesting that programs of delinquency prevention and control should be concerned with both components of this rejection process.

These findings, on the surface, are not consistent with some recent findings regarding the class background of delinquent youth. Several recent studies using the anonymous questionnaires where high school youth are asked to "self-report" their commission of delinquent acts, have failed to establish any relationship between social class and delinquency in rural areas or in small towns. 13/ On the other hand, a recent comprehensive study confirmed the previous generalization that delinquent youth are predominantly from lower class backgrounds. 14/

These two sets of findings are not actually inconsistent; they deal with different things. Self-report data include only the commission of acts, not the reaction of the community or its agents to these acts. This limitation, of course, has been noted by users of the technique. 15/ Since self-report data do not include community reaction (or the presumed reaction on the part of the youth), they must be considered as pertaining to a different body of information. Cloward and Ohlin have expressed it this way: an important ingredient in defining the nature or interpretation of a deviant act is the offender's perception of the probable reaction to his act. 16/ Acts which are behaviorally identical but have different presumed reactions must be interpreted in different ways.

The concept of "delinquency" is inexorably bound up with the community's reaction to deviant behavior. Because the social class background of youth are intimately related to the willingness of a community to tolerate delinquency, it is important to the discussion of the nature of delinquency itself. Findings showing that delinquency and school withdrawl are closely related to economic and alienation themes, are congruent with the operation of the class system in the hinterland community.

There is some evidence supporting a subcultural theme of delinquency. While there are no "gangs" as we use the term to apply to the group behavior of metropolitan slum delinquents, some commonly held norms and common patterns of behavior differentiate delinquents from nondelinquents. Trouble-prone youth are much more likely to indicate friendship with youth who have "been in trouble with the police." They are more likely to think that "stirring up a little excitement" is status conferring among males, and they are likely to spend more evenings with friends than with their family or in organized activities. Furthermore, data from the Juvenile Department show that among males in a typical year, around three-fourths of the referrals will include a companion who was involved in the offense. Each of these pieces of information supports the notion that there is an important social context of delinquency in the hinterland. The social context is dominated by components of a male subculture, and delinquency in Lane County is predominantly a male phenomenon.

There is an additional family theme found in these data. Trouble-prone youth come less often from homes where both natural parents are living together. Additionally, these boys are less likely to spend their evenings with their families, and are less likely to report spending spare time with their fathers.

In summary, the trouble-prone males in the small urban area of this hinterland county exhibit behavior marked by economic, alienation, subcultural, and familial themes. The economic-alienation dimensions produced consistent and important differences between delinquents and nondelinquents. Some evidence suggested there is a subcultural base of this troublesome behavior and that family status is related to the delinquency producing process.

THE COMMUNITY CONTEXT OF DELINQUENCY

Prior sections dealt either with the young persons or with the juvenile authorities. Limited data available from the community surveys suggest some ideas about the community context within which delinquency occurs.

First, adults and adolescents perceive delinquent behavior differently as do parents of adolescent children and "other" adults. By and large, parents are more tolerant than nonparents; the parents are less likely to label a given act "delinquent." In the "minor" offenses such as "truancy," "breaks a window," or "runs away" adults are less willing to call the act delinquent than adolescents. On the other hand, adolescents are less likely than adults to consider "running with a gang" or "drinking" as delinquent acts.

Second, adults and adolescents do not agree on the causes of delinquent behavior, each blames their own group. Thus, adolescents are more likely to say that the youngster himself should get the blame, whereas parents are more likely to place the blame on parents.

Third, the largest proportions of both youth and adults believe that the youth who repeatedly breaks the law should be turned over to a professional agency. A major difference between these groups occurred in the second choice. A greater proportion of the youth said that the youngster should be turned over to his family, whereas adults were not at all optimistic about the family and, instead, recommended professional treatment.

Among adults in the three communities, neither delinquency nor dropouts are viewed as a major problem (by over 80 percent of the population). Even so, the adults approve of spending money on programs for special education, youth employment, forestry camps, increased psychological services for treating juvenile problems, and increased efforts to prevent drop-outs.

HINTERLAND DELINQUENCY, A SUMMARY

Hinterland delinquency is a different kind of "thing" than urban delinquency. Results from other studies, as well as the Lane County data, show that delinquency in rural areas generally is less serious in terms of the acts committed and is treated in a more lenient manner; i.e., rural communities are somewhat more tolerant of misbehavior. The delinquency that does exist is a male problem, occurs predominately among youth from lower economic social status backgrounds, reflects alienation from community and school, and seems to have a subcultural component. Adults seem to be relatively tolerant of youth and do not perceive either delinquency or school drop-outs as major problems. At the same time, adults appear willing to support a number of programs to bring about improved services to trouble-prone youth.

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGES FOR IN-SCHOOL NONDELINQUENT, IN-SCHOOL DELINQUENT, OUT-OF-SCHOOL NONDELINQUENT, AND OUT-OF-SCHOOL DELINQUENT MALE YOUTH IN THE SMALL CITY AREA AMONG SELECTED ECONOMIC, ALIENATION, SUBCULTURAL, AND FAMILY VARIABLES

Variable	In-School Nondelinquent (N=763) %	In-School Delinquent (N=56) %	Out-of-School Nondelinquent (N=41) %	Out-of-School Delinquent (N=13) %
Fathers in white collar occupations	54	43	23	0
Fathers having at least 12 years of education	71	52	37	8
Agree that opportunity for advancement "not very good"	11	21	43	54
Agree that the local Public School system is "very good"	50	55	18	23
Agree that their High School is an excellent High School to attend	53	54	20	0
Agree that "school is dull and boring"	30	41	58	85
Disagree that a boy is delinquent when he habitually skips school	25	23	40	46
In College Preparatory classes	48	32	7	0
Prefer "solid" subjects (science, math, social science, English)	50	30	39	31
Participate in one or more school organizations	49	23	30	31
Perceive their position as being close to the "center of things"	54	25	32	31
Agree that a few individuals "control" things in the school	46	52	49	54

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGES FOR DELINQUENT AND NONDELINQUENT MALE YOUTH IN THE SMALL CITY AREA, continued, page 2.

Variable	In-School Nondelinquent (N=763)	In-School Delinquent (N=56)	Out-of-School Nondelinquent (N=41)	Out-of-School Delinquent (N=13
Believe that "high grades" are an important determinant of status among males	50	43	40	15
Most frequent or modal grade of "C", "D", or "F"	60	82		
Perceived by teachers as potential school drop-outs	9	18		
Perceived by teachers as potential school	3	14		
Characterized by high degree of seriousness of purpose	26	16		
Characterized by high degree of "industry"	28	12		
Characterized by high degree of initiative	25	9		
Characterized by high degree of relations toward others	20	9		
Characterized by high degree of responsibility	26	12		
Characterized by high degree of emotional stability	28	12		
Friends have been in trouble with the police	53	86	69	80
Believe that "stirring up a little excitement" is an important determinant of status among males	53	55	62	69

TABLE 1. PERCENTAGES FOR DELINQUENT AND NONDELINQUENT MALE YOUTH IN THE SMALL CITY AREA, continued, page 3.

Variable	In-School Nondelinquent (N=763)	In-School Delinquent (N=56)	Out-of-School Nondelinquent (N=41)	Out-of-School Delinquent (N=13)
Spend two or more evenings per week with friends	47	64	68	59
Spend two or more evenings per week at home with the family	80	73	55	46
Spend no spare time at all during the week with their father	16	21	25	38
Natural family is not intact	19	27	54	37

FOOTNOTES

1. Lentz, William P. "Rural Urban Differentials and Juvenile Delinquency." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, October, 1956, 47, 331-339.

2. Clinard, Marshall B. "Rural Criminal Offenders." American Journal of Sociology, July, 1944, 50, 38-45.

3. Lentz, op. cit.

4. Clinard, Marshall B. "The Process of Urbanization and Criminal Behavior." American Journal of Sociology, September, 1942, 48, 202-213.

5. Lentz, op. cit.

6. Clinard, "The Process of Urbanization and Criminal Behavior." op. cit.

7. Empey, LaMar T., and Rabow, Jerome. "The Provo Experiment in Delinquency Rehabilitation." American Sociological Review, October, 1961, 26, 674-695.

8. Clark, John P., and Wenninger, Eugene P. "Socio-Economic Class and Area as Correlates of Illegal Behavior Among Juveniles." American Sociological Review, December, 1962, 27, 826-834.

9. Hollingshead, August B. Elmtown's Youth, New York: John Wiley & Co., 1961, p. 410.

10. Hopper, Edward P. The Handling of Social Deviants in Two Rural Counties, Springfield, Illinois: Illinois Youth Commission, 1961 (mimeo), pp. 33-34.

11. Adams, William T. "Delinquency Among Minorities in Rural Areas." paper read at the American Society of Criminology Meeting, Denver, Colorado, December 29, 1961.

12. Esselstyn, T. C. "The Social Role of a County Sheriff." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, August, 1953, 44, 177-184, 182.

13. Clark and Wenninger, op. cit., Short, James E., and Nye, F. Ivan. "Reported Behavior as a Criterion of Deviant Behavior." Social Problems, Winter, 1957-1958, 5, 207-213; and Dentler, Robert A., and Monroe, Lawrence J. "Early Adolescent Theft." American Sociological Review, October, 1961, 26, 733-743.

14. Hollingshead, August B. Elmtown's Youth, New York: Wiley, 1949; Havighurst, Robert J., et. al., Growing up in River City, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.

15. Monroe and Dentler, op. cit., 733.

16. Cloward, Richard A., and Ohlin, Lloyd E. Delinquency and Opportunity, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960, p. 6